

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCUNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCUNITED STATES Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,900	12/29/2005	Mark Kenneth Jablonski	148-02	9402
23713 7590 05/25/2007 GREENLEE WINNER AND SULLIVAN P C 4875 PEARL EAST CIRCLE			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
	SUITE 200 BOULDER, CO 80301		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
200221, 0			. 2828	
•				
•	•	•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	·		05/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•						
-	-	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/537,900	JABLONSKI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Dung (Michael) T. Nguyen	2828			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte afte - If NO - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Does not soft ime may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Disperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (a). In no event, however, may a reply be the will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	DN. imely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 A</u>	pril 2007.				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	/ -					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-6,11,13,14,17,18,20,22-24,26,28-3</u>	<u>0,32,34-37,41 and 47-54</u> is/are p	pending in the application.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.				
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
·	Claim(s) <u>1-6,11,13,14,18,20,22-24,26,28-30,3</u>	<u>2,34-37,41 and 47-54</u> is/are reje	cted.			
·	Claim(s) <u>17</u> is/are objected to.	er alastian raquirament				
اـــا(٥	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	tion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. Es have been received in Applica rity documents have been received in CPCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National Stage			
Attachme	nt(s)	· ·				
1) 🛛 Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I				
	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		Patent Application			
,	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/537,900

Art Unit: 2828

DETAILED ACTION

The indicated allowed claims 22 and 34 are withdrawn due to the new ground of rejection.

Claim Objections

Claim 51 is objected to because of the following informalities: nanot5ubes should be corrected. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 26, 28-30, 32, 34-37, 41, 50, 52, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sakaibara et al. (2005/0069669).

With respect to claims 26, 28, 34, 37, 41, and 52, Fig.5 shows a pulsed laser (para.0093) mode locking element comprising one or more layers containing carbon nanotubes (SWNTs) 11 (it is understood that carbon nanotubes are used for the saturable absorption function (saturable absorber) and therefore the laser is mode locked as well known in the art and also as pointed out in the abstract of this instant application); wherein the carbon nanotubes are provided in a layer

Art Unit: 2828

the thickness of which is varied to adjust the mode-locking and/or Q-switching threshold optical energy (para.0022-0023).

With respect to claims 29-30, para.0022 discloses the carbon nanotubes are selected to have a range of different diameters to provide a wide operating bandwidth.

With respect to claim 32, para.0070 and 0075 disclose the carbon nanotubes are capable of operation in both reflection and transmission mode.

With respect to claim 35, Fig.5 shows a layer of carbon nanotubes 11 is provided on a substrate surface 12.

With respect to claim 36, Fig.6 shows the other face of the substrate 12 is provided with a half mirror 14.

With respect to claim 50, Fig.5 shows carbon nanotubes 11 are in the waveguide (light passed through).

With respect to claim 54, para.0086 discloses a femtosecond laser.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 11, 13-14, 18, 20, 22-24, 47-48, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheps (6539041) in view of Sakaibara et al. (2005/0069669).

With respect to claims 1, 3, 18, 22, 47-48, and 53, Scheps shows in fig. 1 a laser for generating light pulses at a selected operating wavelength or range of wavelengths and a selected fundamental repetition frequency comprising:

- (a) one or more optical resonators 150, 154 or a closed optical path where a light pulse can build up over multiple round trips; wherein the one or more resonators or the closed optical path comprises one or more gain mediums 106, 118 and wherein the round trip path length is selected to give the selected fundamental repetition frequency;
 - (b) one or more pump light sources 102;
- (c) one or more optical couplers (col.2, 1.1-3) for coupling pump light from the pump light source into the one or more gain mediums to provide optical gain at the selected operating wavelength or range of wavelengths;
- (d) one or more nonlinear optical or saturable absorber elements 110 (col.2, l.18-21) or devices optically coupled with the one or more optical resonators or the closed optical path and
 - (e) one or more optical couplers 112, 126for coupling light pulses out of the laser. Scheps lacks one or more of the saturable absorber comprises carbon nanotubes.

Art Unit: 2828

Sakaibara et al. teach one or more of the saturable absorber comprises carbon nanotubes in fig.5-6 and para.0009.

it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Scheps what is taught by Sakaibara et al. to have a high saturable absorption function (para.0021) with extremely low cost and efficiency (para.0108).

With respect to claims 2 and 4, Scheps discloses in fig.1 a wavelength tuning element 122.

With respect to claim 5, it is understood that carbon nanotubes are used for the saturable absorption function (saturable absorber) and therefore the laser is mode locked as admitted in the disclosure of this instant application on page 2).

With respect to claim 6, Sakaibara et al. disclose in para.0093 the mode locker is an optical pulse-initiating, self starting element.

With respect to claims 11 and 13, Scheps discloses in col.2, l.18-21 a Q-switch cooperated with the saturable absorber.

With respect to claim 14, Sakaibara et al. disclose in para.0093 optical pulses of length less than 1 picosecond.

Art Unit: 2828

With respect to claim 20, Sakaibara et al. disclose in para.0088 the carbon nanotubes are provided in a layer less than or equal to about 10 microns in thickness.

With respect to claim 23, Sakaibara et al. disclose in para.0064 the carbon nanotubes comprise 50% or more by weight of semiconductor carbon nanotubes.

With respect to claim 24, Sakaibara et al. disclose in para.0022 the diameters of the carbon nanotubes are selected to exhibit an exciton absorption in the operating wavelength range of the laser.

Claims 49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheps (6539041) in view of Sakaibara et al. (2005/0069669) and further in view of Risch et al. (20040109652). Scheps (6539041) and Sakaibara et al. (2005/0069669) disclose all limitations of the claims except for the carbon nanotubes are optical fiber.

Risch et al. teach the carbon nanotubes are optical fiber (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Scheps and Sakaibara et al. to save cost and protect the fiber from the possible attenuation of the signal transmitted (para.0015-0016).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 04/02/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,900 Page 7

Art Unit: 2828

On pages 10-12, Applicants argued that Sakaibara does not teach a laser mode-locking element containing carbon nanotubes to generate laser pulses. The examiner does not concur.

Indeed, Sakaibara do disclose in Fig.5 and para.0083-0093 a laser mode-locking element containing carbon nanotubes to generate laser pulses and the above rejection would explain why the claimed limitations are met.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Communication Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung (Michael) T Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1949. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Min Harvey can be reached on (571) 272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3329.

Michael Dung Nguyen

5/10/07